

**FITCHBURG GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY  
ELECTRIC DIVISION RATE REQUEST**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
JAMES H. AIKMAN**

**Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy**

**D.T.E. 02 –**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY.....	3
III.	SUMMARY.....	3
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF DEPRECIATION.....	4
V.	PROCEDURES EMPLOYED.....	6
VI.	DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES.....	14
VII.	SCHEDULES	
	SCHEDULE-1	Depreciation Study

1   **I.   INTRODUCTION**

2  
3   Q.   Please state your name, address, and business affiliation.

4   A.   My name is James H. Aikman. My business address is 2921 Windmill Road, Suite 4,  
5       Sinking Spring, PA 19608. I am a Managing Consultant with Management Applications  
6       Consulting, Inc. (MAC).

7  
8   Q.   Please describe MAC.

9   A.   MAC is a management consulting firm which provides rate and regulatory services,  
10       including depreciation.

11  
12   Q.   Will you please describe your education and business experience?

13   A.   I am a graduate of the University of Illinois from which I hold a Bachelor of Science  
14       degree in Civil Engineering. I have worked in the area of depreciation since November  
15       1967, when I assumed a position on the engineering staff of the Missouri Public Service  
16       Commission (PSC). During my employment with the PSC, I assisted in the preparation of  
17       numerous depreciation rate studies and testified regarding depreciation rates in two cases -  
18       - one water utility and one electric utility. I was employed by Gilbert Associates from  
19       August 1971 to June 1984, then by Management Resources International, Inc. from July  
20       1984 until September 2001 when I joined MAC. Since 1971, I have worked on numerous  
21       depreciation rate studies for gas and electric utilities and I have testified on depreciation  
22       matters in Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine,

1 Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island,  
2 South Carolina, Vermont, the City of New Orleans, Nova Scotia, Canada, and before the  
3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

4  
5 Q. Are you a registered professional engineer?

6 A. Yes. I am registered in the states of Illinois, Missouri, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

7  
8 Q. Are you a member of any professional organizations?

9 A. Yes, I am a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Society of  
10 Depreciation Professionals.

11  
12 Q. Please describe the duties and responsibilities of your current position

13 A. As the depreciation specialist of our organization, I am currently Project Manager of  
14 several depreciation rate studies, including the studies of the Fitchburg Gas and Electric  
15 Light Company (FG&E or the Company) for both the gas and electric divisions. As  
16 Project Manager, I am responsible for planning the studies, delineating and coordinating  
17 data collection, ensuring the accuracy of the data and properly reflecting any accounting  
18 adjustments. Beyond data collection, I am responsible for the performance and  
19 interpretation of statistical analyses and the preparation of appropriate schedules to reflect  
20 the results of the studies.

**II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to present and support the current depreciation study and associated depreciation accrual rates for the electric division of FG&E.

Q. Was the FG&E electric division depreciation study made by you and/or under your supervision and direction?

A. Yes.

**III. SUMMARY**

Q. Have you prepared an exhibit summarizing your studies?

A. Yes, the results of my study is shown in a report titled “Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company – Depreciation Rate Study - Depreciation Accrual Rates Based On Electric, Gas and Common Plant in Service at December 31, 2001” (the Depreciation Study) identified as Schedule JHA-1 (Electric).

Q. Please summarize the results of the Depreciation Study.

A. As shown on pages 38 and 39 of the Depreciation Study, Schedule JHA-1 (Electric), the composite of the proposed individual electric plant account rates is 4.73%, and for common

1 plant, 6.19% (page 42). The new accrual rate results in an estimated increase of  
2 \$1,065,400 in the electric plant depreciation expense (as shown on page 10 of Schedule  
3 JHA-1 (Electric). The significant increase in the depreciation rates over the existing  
4 depreciation accrual rates is primarily due to changes in net salvage estimates, although the  
5 electric plant increase is somewhat offset by higher average life estimates.

6  
7 Q. Are the contents of the Depreciation Study true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

8 A. Yes.

9  
10 **IV. DESCRIPTION OF DEPRECIATION**

11  
12 Q. Are you familiar with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners  
13 definition of depreciation?

14 A. Yes. The definition of depreciation adopted by the National Association of Regulatory  
15 Utility Commissioners (NARUC) is:

16  
17 "Depreciation, as applied to depreciable utility plant, means the loss in service value  
18 not restored by current maintenance incurred in connection with the consumption or  
19 prospective retirement of utility plant in the course of service from causes which are  
20 known to be in current operation and against which the utility is not protected by  
21 insurance. Among the causes to be given consideration are wear and tear, decay,  
22 action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence, changes in the art, changes in

1 demand, and requirements of public authorities.”

2  
3 The Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (DTE) is a member of  
4 NARUC.

5  
6 Another commonly referenced definition of depreciation is that of the American Institute of  
7 Certified Public Accountants (AICPA):

8  
9 "Depreciation accounting is a system of accounting which aims to distribute the cost  
10 or other basic value of tangible capital assets, less salvage (if any) over the estimated  
11 useful life of the unit (which may be a group of assets) in a systematic and rational  
12 manner. It is a process of allocation, not of valuation. Depreciation for the year is  
13 the portion of the total charge under such a system that is allocated to the year.  
14 Although the allocation may properly take into account occurrences during the year,  
15 it is not intended to be a measurement of the effect of all such occurrences.”

16  
17 The two foregoing citations are found on pages 13 and 14 (respectively) of “Public Utility  
18 Depreciation Practices”, August 1996, by the NARUC Staff Subcommittee on  
19 Depreciation.

20  
21 It is in my opinion the AICPA definition helps clarify the NARUC definition in that it  
22 brings out the “allocation of cost” aspect.

1  
2 Q. What is the purpose of periodic book depreciation rate studies, such as those which you  
3 performed for the Company?

4 A. Consistent with the definitions above, the purpose of depreciation studies is to develop  
5 depreciation accrual rates reflective of engineering judgment, current industry and specific  
6 company experience, and current projections for the future, for the particular depreciable  
7 assets under study. The objective of depreciation as an element of the cost of service is to  
8 provide for the appropriate recovery of the investments in depreciable assets over a life  
9 term that assures the full recovery of the investments less estimated net salvage.  
10

11 **V. PROCEDURES EMPLOYED**  
12

13 Q. What procedures did you employ in your study?

14 A. First, I created the depreciation study data bases on our computer. The Company provided  
15 us with the necessary property accounting history to create the data bases through year end  
16 2000 and 2001. I was also provided the FG&E recent electric and common plant account  
17 level gross salvage and removal cost histories. In addition, I inspected the actual physical  
18 plant of the Company and held discussions with the Company management concerning  
19 matters relevant to depreciation.  
20

21 Q. What did you do next in your study?



1 A. I analyzed the historical data using computerized statistical routines and evaluated the  
2 output by considering the indications from the statistical analyses of plant accounting  
3 history, input from Company management, the character of the depreciable assets,  
4 knowledge gained during property inspections, my experience with like assets, and  
5 engineering knowledge and judgment. Final calculations were then made to develop the  
6 recommended remaining life accrual rates for each category of plant as shown in the  
7 Depreciation Study (Schedule JHA-1 (Electric)) sections entitled "Schedules" (pages 38 to  
8 42).

9  
10 Q. You previously referred to "statistical analyses". Would you please explain what is meant  
11 by this term?

12 A. I am referring to Simulated Plant Record (SPR) life analysis, a well known and well  
13 accepted technique employed in depreciation studies. Whenever there is an adequate  
14 volume and frequency of additions and retirements, it is possible to perform SPR life  
15 analysis.

16  
17 SPR life analyses are known by some as "semi-actuarial life analyses". The SPR-Balances  
18 (BAL) analysis I used in these studies is an iterative procedure in which certain values  
19 (survivor factors) from empirical survivor curves (Iowa curves) are applied to the actual,  
20 recorded annual additions to generate theoretical surviving year-end balances. The  
21 procedure identifies the empirical curves that best simulate the actual ending balances in a  
22 specified band of years. As an example, the bands of balance years simulated in these

1 studies were primarily 10 years (1991 to 2000), 20 years (1981 to 2000), and 30 years  
2 (1971 to 2000).

3 The Iowa survivor curves were developed in the 1930's at Iowa State University; they are  
4 empirical curves whose equations are published, along with tables of various values, e.g.,  
5 survivor factors at various ages. Iowa curves are widely accepted in the industry as a  
6 common and convenient means of communicating and calculating technical depreciation  
7 parameters.

8  
9 The SPR life analyses of property history can sometimes provide us with an estimate of the  
10 life of some historical investments, that is, a starting point in the life estimation process;  
11 however, it must be noted that life analysis is not life estimation. Unfortunately, life  
12 analysis can only provide a clue as to what has happened in the past. My obligation is to  
13 estimate what will occur in the future; i.e., I must predict the future, not merely measure the  
14 past.

15  
16 Q. Did you employ any other analyses other than SPR to assist in the life estimation process?

17 A Yes. I also studied the pattern of annual additions to and annual retirements from the plant  
18 accounts to estimate the likely age of retirements, the approximate ages of the balance in  
19 the accounts and to measure the volumes of additions and retirements in various time  
20 periods.

21

1 Q. In evaluating the SPR life analyses, you previously stated that you also considered input  
2 from the Company. What type of information were you seeking?

3  
4 A. I conferred with the Company management to determine if there were any occurrences,  
5 changes in policy, procedure, equipment, or practices which might impact upon service  
6 lives, salvage, or removal cost associated with depreciable assets. My major consideration  
7 was to determine whether indications of the past would likely be representative of the near-  
8 term future.

9  
10 Q. Can you give any examples of specific input provided to you by the Companies which  
11 influenced your life estimates?

12 A. I was advised that manufacturers of electric substation equipment (relays, circuit breakers,  
13 transformers, etc.) “support” the equipment for far fewer years than in the past; that is, they  
14 no longer manufacture spare parts for as long a time period as in the past. The result is  
15 utilities are sometimes forced to replace equipment as opposed to repairing it. I have heard  
16 this same story in Massachusetts and other states. To ignore this fact in the life estimates  
17 of substation equipment would be negligent.

18  
19 Q. Your answers to previous questions indicate judgment and experience are significant  
20 elements in life estimation and in the interpretation of statistical analyses. Do other  
21 depreciation experts and authoritative sources concur?

1 A. Yes, the literature is very clear on this point. For example, on page I.1, The New York  
2 State Department of Public Service publication "Computer Supported Property Mortality  
3 Studies" published in 1971 states:

4  
5 "The purpose of an actuarial mortality study of public utility property is to make a  
6 statistical determination of a representative life table and average service life. The  
7 method used to derive these quantities in this report is that of smoothing and  
8 extending the retirement ratios.

9  
10 It must be clearly understood that the computer procedure explained in Section II  
11 accomplishes electronically only those computations which have had to be done  
12 manually, and nothing else. Because of the computer's large storage capacity and  
13 extremely fast running time, it is able to calculate a great deal more than has ever  
14 been obtained manually in the past.

15  
16 The computer exercises no judgment, reflects no opinions or company policies and  
17 does not forecast the future. The computer programs are merely the results of  
18 applying certain mathematical formulae to a set of statistics obtained from  
19 accounting records - and, based on these data and formulae give an indication of  
20 what has been the retirement experience of the past and what would be the future life  
21 pattern if the same experience were constant over the entire life of the surviving  
22 property under study.

1  
2 Under no circumstances should it be construed that a specific indicated service life  
3 and life table developed by this computer process must necessarily be used as the life  
4 table and average service life in arriving at a final estimate of annual and accrued  
5 depreciation. Stress is placed on the fact that the selected life table and average  
6 service life finally used, whether or not developed by program PSU-2 or PSU-2A  
7 must be the engineer's best estimate for the property under study".  
8

9 Q. Can you provide other citations?

10 A. Mr. Alex E. Bauhan, the person who developed the SPR - Balances Method of life  
11 analysis, cites the need for exercising judgment in his paper in which the Balances Method  
12 was introduced to the industry. In his paper, given in April 1947, to the National  
13 Conference of Electric and Gas Utility Accountants of the American Gas Association  
14 (AGA) and Edison Electric Institute (EEI), under the heading "Multiple Indications" he  
15 states,  
16

17 "The method reads the past and not the future, and has no way of telling which  
18 patterns will be followed in the future. Neither the actuarial or any other statistical  
19 process can eliminate this dilemma. Only by the exercise of reasonable judgment, or  
20 by the passage of time, can a selection be made.

21 In discussing the Retirement Experience Index, regarding the situation where the index is  
22 "poor or valueless", Mr. Bauhan states,

1  
2 "In all such cases, for estimating purposes, the result of the analysis should be  
3 discarded and a judgment figure should be substituted in place of it. In those cases  
4 where the experience index is only fair, the result should be examined critically, and  
5 if it is not supported by reasoned judgment, it should be accordingly modified."

6  
7 Mr. Bauhan's paper is found in the Edison Electric Institute Publication No. 51-23, titled  
8 "Methods of Estimating Utility Plant Life" published in 1952; the foregoing citations are  
9 found on pages 61 and 63, titled respectively. A copy of his paper is included as Appendix  
10 A (pages 43 and following) in the Depreciation Study.

11  
12 The Retirement Experience Index (REI) is the percentage of the accumulated retirements  
13 with the given Iowa curve from the oldest capital addition, e.g., if the oldest addition was  
14 1930, by convention it would be 70.5 years old at year end 2000. If the Iowa curve in  
15 question was a 35 year  $L_{1.0}$ , the REI would be 96; that is, the 35 year  $L_{1.0}$  Iowa curve  
16 shows 4% surviving at age 70.5 years and 100% less 4% equals 96%.

17  
18 There are many more citations to the need for use of judgment in life estimation, several of  
19 which have been included in my testimony in previous regulatory proceedings in  
20 Massachusetts. Notably there are a number of the them in Iowa State University Bulletin

1        125,<sup>1</sup> which is the primary reference for the Iowa curves.

2  
3        In summary, life estimates cannot and must not be interpreted without the use of informed  
4        judgment.

5  
6        Q.    Are you suggesting that the statistical analysis of past retirement experience has little value  
7        in estimating asset lives?

8        A.    No, the point of the foregoing is that life analysis is not life estimation; it takes more than  
9        analyses of history to make realistic average life estimates.

10  
11       In making my recommendations, I rely on my experience in performing numerous  
12       depreciation studies, beginning with my almost four years employment on the engineering  
13       staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, followed by 13 years with Gilbert  
14       Associates, 17 years with Management Resources International, Inc. and my close work  
15       with regulatory commission staff engineers in several states, including Missouri, Arkansas,  
16       Ohio, Florida, Maryland, and Connecticut. In cases where staff engineers have made their  
17       own independent studies, those studies have yielded comparable results that support my  
18       conclusions.

19  
20       Q.    Have you employed your judgment in the case at hand?

---

<sup>1</sup> "Statistical Analyses of Industrial Property Retirements" by Robley Winfrey, published in 1935 by the Engineering Research Institute at Iowa State University.

1 A. Yes, and in that regard, I have conferred with the FG&E management and operating  
2 personnel, I have made property inspections, I have reviewed and considered the types of  
3 property in the various primary plant accounts, and I have made life analyses of the history  
4 of the property. I have relied upon all my prior experience as an engineer in evaluating and  
5 interpreting the life analysis indications.

6  
7 Q. You stated earlier that you made property inspections in connection with this study. Were  
8 the property inspections made to ensure the facilities are adequately maintained?

9 A. Surely that was one objective; however, the inspections were intended to serve several  
10 functions. First and foremost, the inspections verified that the assets identified on the  
11 Company's books actually exist. Second, the inspections verify that the assets continue to  
12 be maintained and are useable. In addition, inspections facilitate discussions regarding the  
13 existing facilities with the Company management who accompany me and provide me a  
14 better understanding of the overall system and the equipment.

15  
16 **VI. DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES**

17  
18 Q. What are the total, composite annual electric and common plant accrual rates which result  
19 from your study?

20 A. The respective composites of the proposed individual account rates detailed in the  
21 Depreciation Study are 4.73%, and 6.19%, as shown on pages 39 and 42 of Schedule JHA-  
22 1 (Electric), the Depreciation Study.



1

2 Q. The electric plant depreciation accrual rates you propose result in considerably higher  
3 depreciation expense than that derived using the existing depreciation accrual rates. What  
4 is the reason for the increase?

5 A. The most significant factor responsible for the increased electric plant depreciation rates  
6 are the changes in the net salvage estimates. In addition, the Depreciation study (Schedule  
7 JHA-1 (Electric)), at page 8, shows that the electric plant average life estimates are higher  
8 than those which are reflected in the existing depreciation accrual rates. It is a given in  
9 most instances that the lower the average service life, the higher the depreciation accrual  
10 rate and the lower the net salvage, the higher the depreciation accrual rate. The change in  
11 net salvage caused an increase in the electric plant depreciation rates, which was somewhat  
12 offset by the higher average life estimates, resulting in a net increase to the depreciation  
13 accrual rates.

14

15 Q. Your previous response infers that your net salvage estimates are lower than those implicit  
16 in the existing depreciation accrual rates. Why are your estimates lower?

17 A. In an overall sense, environmental concerns and disposal requirements have changed since  
18 the prior depreciation rate studies. These concerns and requirements impact all businesses  
19 and all of us personally. For example, I now pay a fee to dispose of automobile tires and  
20 batteries that I didn't pay 20 years ago and I pay \$25 to \$40 for the disposal of each  
21 mattress, stove, refrigerator, etc. As to electric utilities, another example is oil-filled  
22 equipment, such as line transformers. Twenty years ago utilities could realize gross

1 salvage via the sale of retired transformers for scrap, whereas now they must pay to have  
2 them hauled away.

3  
4 Q. In the Depreciation Study you talk of your estimates being conservative. Can you provide  
5 an example as to how you exercised some conservatism in establishing the depreciation  
6 rates?

7 A. Yes. In Account 367, Underground Conductors and Devices, FG&E has realized net  
8 salvage of (125.2)% in the 1981 to 2000 period, (128.6)% in the 1991 to 2000 period and  
9 (158.2)% in the 1996 to 2000 period. My proposed accrual rate incorporates an estimated  
10 (50)% net salvage, a more realistic value, in my opinion, and a parameter which contributes  
11 to a lower accrual rate than if (125)% or (150)% had been used.

12  
13 Q. The proposed common plant depreciation rates are also higher than the existing. What is  
14 the reason for the change?

15 A. In the case of common plant, my net salvage estimate is higher than the existing, which  
16 mitigates to some extent the effect of the lower average life estimates of my study.

17  
18 Q. Does the Depreciation Study provide a comparison of the existing average life and net  
19 salvage estimates to those you propose?

20 A. Yes. The Summary section of the Depreciation Study contains such comparisons and also  
21 a comparison of the estimated depreciation expense. These are on pages 8, 9 and 10.

1 Q. Does this complete your testimony?

2 A. Yes.

3

4 BS80164v1